arXiv:1611.07324v1 [math.PR] 22 Nov 2016

On the mixing time of the flip walk on triangulations of the sphere

Thomas Budzinski *

Abstract

A simple way to sample a uniform triangulation of the sphere with a fixed number n of vertices is a Monte-Carlo method: we start from an arbitrary triangulation and flip repeatedly a uniformly chosen edge. We give a lower bound in $n^{5/4}$ on the mixing time of this Markov chain.

1 Introduction

Much attention has been given recently to the study of large uniform triangulations of the sphere. Historically, these triangulations have been first considered by physicists as a discrete model for quantum gravity. Before the introduction of more direct tools (bijection with trees or peeling process), the first simulations [6, 7] were made using a Monte-Carlo method based on flips of triangulations.

More precisely, for all $n \geq 3$, let $\mathscr{T}_n$ be the set of rooted type-I triangulations of the sphere with n vertices (that is, triangulations that may contain loops and multiple edges, equipped with a distinguished oriented edge). If t is a triangulation we write $V(t)$ for the set of its vertices and $E(t)$ for the set of its edges. If $t \in \mathscr{T}_n$ and $e \in E(t)$, we write $\mathfrak{flip}(t, e)$ for the triangulation obtained by removing the edge e from t and drawing the other diagonal of the face of degree 4 that appears. We say that $\mathfrak{flip}(t, e)$ is obtained from t by *flipping* the edge e (cf. Figure 1). Note that it is possible to flip a loop and to flip the root edge. The only case in which an edge cannot be flipped is if both of its sides are adjacent to the same face like the edge e_2 on Figure 1. In this case $\mathfrak{flip}(t, e) = t$. Note that there is a natural bijection between $E(t)$ and $E(\mathfrak{flip}(t, e))$. When there is no ambiguity, we shall sometimes treat an element of one of these two sets as if it belonged to the other.

The graph of triangulations of the sphere in which two triangulations are related if one can pass to the other by flipping an edge has already been studied: it is connected [15] and its diameter is linear in n [8]. Note that these works deal with type-III triangulations, that is, triangulations with neither multiple edges nor self-loops, whereas we allow both, but it is easy to see that these results extend to our setup. [1]

*ENS Paris and Université Paris-Saclay, thomas.budzinski@ens.fr

[1] Indeed, if t is a finite triangulation with loops, it contains a *minimal* loop, that is, a loop dividing the sphere in two parts, one of which contains no loop. By flipping a minimal loop we decrease the number of loops, so we can delete all loops in a linear number of flips. Moreover, if t contains no loop and there are two edges e_1, e_2 between the same pair of vertices, then flipping e_1 does not create any loop or additional multiple edges, so we can also delete all multiple edges in a linear number of flips.



Figure 1: An example of flip of an edge. The orange edge e_2 is not flippable.

We define a Markov chain $(T_n(k))_{k\geq 0}$ on $\mathscr{T}_n$ as follows: conditionally on $(T_n(0), \dots, T_n(k))$, let e_k be a uniformly chosen edge of $T_n(k)$. We take $T_n(k+1) = \mathfrak{flip}(T_n(k), e_k)$. It is easy to see that the uniform measure on $\mathscr{T}_n$ is reversible, thus stationary for $(T_n(k))_{k\geq 0}$, so this Markov chain will converge to the uniform distribution (the irreducibility is guaranteed by the connectedness results described above and the aperiodicity by the possible existence of non flippable edges). It is then natural to estimate the mixing time of $(T_n(k))_{k\geq 0}$ (see Chapter 4.5 of [12] for a proper definition of the mixing time). Our theorem provides a lower bound.

Theorem 1. There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 3$ the mixing time of the Markov chain $(T_n(k))_{k\geq 0}$ is at least $cn^{5/4}$.

Mixing times for other types of flip chains have also been investigated. For triangulations of a convex n-gon without inner vertices it is known that the mixing time is polynomial and at least of order $n^{3/2}$ (see [13, 14]). In particular, our proof was partly inspired by the proof of the lower bound in [14]. Finally, see [3] for estimates on the mixing time of the flip walk on *lattice triangulations*, that is, triangulations whose vertices are points on a lattice and with Boltzmann weights depending on the total length of their edges.

The strategy of our proof is as follows: we start with two independent uniform triangulations with a boundary of length 1 and $\frac{n}{2}$ inner vertices and glue them together along their boundaries. We obtain a triangulation of the sphere with a cycle of length 1 such that half of the vertices lie on each side of this cycle. We then start our Markov chain from this triangulation and discover one of the two sides of the cycle gradually by a peeling procedure. By using the estimates of Curien and Le Gall [4] and a result of Krikun about separating cycles in the UIPT [9], we show that after $o(n^{5/4})$ flips, with high probability, the triangulation still has a cycle of length $o(n^{1/4})$, on each side of which lie a proportion at least $\frac{1}{4}$ of the vertices. But by a result of Le Gall and Paulin [11], this is not the case in a uniform triangulation (this is the discrete counterpart of the homeomorphicity of the Brownian map to the sphere), which shows that a time $o(n^{5/4})$ is not enough to approach the uniform distribution.

2 Combinatorial preliminaries and couplings

For all $n \geq 3$, we recall that $\mathscr{T}_n$ is the set of rooted type-I triangulations of the sphere with n vertices. For $n \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$ we also write $\mathscr{T}_{n,p}$ for the set of triangulations with a boundary of length p and n inner vertices, that is, planar maps with $n+p$ vertices in which all faces are triangles except one called the *outer face* whose boundary is a simple cycle of length p, equipped

with a root edge such that the outer face touches the root edge on its right. We will sometimes refer to n and p as the *volume* and the *perimeter* of the triangulation.

The number of triangulations with fixed volume and perimeter can be computed by a result of Krikun. Here is (the case $r = 0$ of) the main theorem of [10]:

$$\#\mathscr{T}_{n,p} = \frac{p(2p)!}{(p!)^2}\frac{4^{n-1}(2p+3n-5)!!}{n!(2p+n-1)!!} \underset{n\to+\infty}{\sim} C(p)\lambda_c^{-n}n^{-5/2}, \tag{1}$$

where $\lambda_c = \frac{1}{12\sqrt{3}}$ and $C(p) = \frac{3^{p-2}p(2p)!}{4\sqrt{2\pi}(p!)^2}$. In particular, a triangulation of the sphere with n vertices is equivalent after a root transformation to a triangulation with a boundary of length 1 and $n-1$ inner vertices (see for example Figure 2 in [5]), so

$$\#\mathscr{T}_n = \#\mathscr{T}_{n-1,1} = 2\frac{4^{n-2}\,(3n-6)!!}{(n-1)!\,n!!}. \tag{2}$$

For $n \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$ we write $T_{n,p}$ for a uniform triangulation with a boundary of length p and n inner vertices, and T_n for a uniform triangulation of the sphere with n vertices. We also recall that the UIPT, that we write T_∞, is an infinite planar triangulation whose distribution is characterized by the following equality for any triangulation t with a hole of perimeter p:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(t \subset T_\infty\right) = C(p)\lambda_c^{|t|}, \tag{3}$$

where λ_c and the $C(p)$ are as above and $|t|$ is the total number of vertices of t.

From these enumeration formulas it is possible to deduce precise coupling results between finite and infinite maps. The result we will need is similar to Proposition 12 of [2] but a bit more general since it deals with triangulations with a boundary. We recall that in a triangulation t of the sphere or the plane, the *ball* of radius r, that we write $B_r(t)$, is the triangulation with holes formed by those faces adjacent to at least one vertex lying at distance at most $r-1$ from the root, along with all their edges and vertices. If t is infinite, the *hull* of radius r, that we write $B_r^\bullet(t)$, is the union of $B_r(t)$ and all the bounded connected components of its complementary. If t is finite, it is the union of $B_r(t)$ and all the connected components of its complementary except the one that contains the most vertices. If T is a triangulation with a boundary, we adopt the same definitions but we replace the distance to the root by the distance to the boundary.

Lemma 1. Let $p_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $r_n = o(n^{1/4})$ with $p_n = o(r_n^2)$. Then there are $r'_n = o(r_n)$ and couplings between T_{n,p_n} and T_∞ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_\infty)\backslash B^\bullet_{r'_n}(T_\infty) \subset B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{n,p_n})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

In other words, there is a cycle γ' of length p_n around the root of T_∞ that lies inside of its hull of radius r'_n and a cycle γ in T_{n,p_n} that stays at distance at most r_n from its boundary, such that the part of the hull of radius r_n of T_∞ that lies outside of γ' is isomorphic to the part of T_{n,p_n} that lies between its boundary and γ (see Figure 2).

Proof. We start by describing a coupling between the UIPT and the UIPT with a boundary of length p_n, that we write T_{∞,p_n}. We consider the peeling by layers $\mathscr{L}$ of the UIPT (see section 4.1 of [4]) and we write τ_{p_n} for the first time at which the perimeter of the discovered region is equal to p_n (note that this time is always finite since the perimeter can increase by at most



Figure 2: Illustration of Lemma 1. With high probability, there are two cycles γ' and γ such that the two green parts coincide.

1 at each peeling step). By the spatial Markov property of the UIPT, the part that is still unknown at time τ_{p_n} has the distribution of T_{∞,p_n}. Moreover, by the results of Curien and Le Gall (Theorem 1 of [4]) and since $p_n = o(r_n^2)$, we have $\tau_{p_n} = o(r_n^3)$. By using Proposition 9 of [4] (more precisely the convergence of H), we obtain that the smallest hull of T_∞ containing $t^{\mathscr{L}}_{\tau_{p_n}}(T_\infty)$ has radius $o(r_n)$ in probability. Hence, our result holds if we replace T_{n,p_n} by T_{∞,p_n}.

Hence, it is enough to prove that there are couplings between T_{∞,p_n} and T_{n,p_n} such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{n,p_n}) = B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{\infty,p_n})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

The proof relies on asymptotic enumeration results and is essentially the same as that of Proposition 12 of [2]: by using the above coupling of T_{∞,p_n} and T_∞ we can show that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}|\partial B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{\infty,p_n})|, \frac{1}{n}|B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{\infty,p_n})|\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(P)} 0.$$

Moreover, if $q_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $v_n = o(n)$ and if t_n is a triangulation with two holes of perimeters p_n and q_n (rooted on the boundary of the p_n-gon) and v_n vertices that is a possible value of $B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{\infty,p_n})$ for all $n \geq 0$, then

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{n,p_n}) = t_n\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{\infty,p_n}) = t_n\right)} \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1$$

by the enumeration results, and we can conclude as in Proposition 12 of [2]. □

We will also need another coupling lemma where we do not compare hulls of a fixed radius, but rather the parts of triangulations that have been discover after a fixed number of peeling steps. Let t be a triangulation and $\mathscr{A}$ be a peeling algorithm, that is, a way to assign to every finite triangulation with one hole an edge on the boundary of the hole. We write $t^{\mathscr{A}}_j(t)$ for the part of t discovered after j steps of filled-in peeling following algorithm $\mathscr{A}$. By "filled-in" we mean that everytime the peeled face separates the unknown part of the map in two connected

components we reveal the one with fewer vertices (if the map is infinite and one-ended, we reveal the bounded component).

Lemma 2. Let $j_n = o(n^{3/4})$, and let $\mathscr{A}$ be a peeling algorithm. Then there are couplings between T_n and T_∞ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_n) = t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_\infty)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

Proof. We write $P_\infty(j)$ and $V_\infty(j)$ for respectively the perimeter and volume of $t_j^{\mathscr{A}}(T_\infty)$. By the results of [4] we have the convergences

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{0\le j\le j_n} P_\infty(j) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sup_{0\le j\le j_n} V_\infty(j) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0 \tag{4}$$

in probability, so there are $p_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $v_n = o(n)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(P_\infty(j_n) \le p_n \text{ and } V_\infty(j_n) \le v_n\right) \to 1.$$

But by the enumeration results (1), (2) and by (3), if t_n is a triangulation with perimeter at most p_n and volume at most v_n, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_n) = t_n\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_\infty) = t_n\right)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}\big(t_n \subset T_n\big)}{\mathbb{P}\big(t_n \subset T_\infty\big)} \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

As in Proposition 12 of [2], this proves that the total variation distance between the distributions of $t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_n)$ and $t_{j_n}^{\mathscr{A}}(T_\infty)$ goes to 0 as $n \to +\infty$, which proves our claim and the lemma. □

By combining this last lemma and the estimates (4), we immediately obtain estimates about the peeling process on finite uniform triangulations. We write $P_n(j)$ and $V_n(j)$ for the perimeter and volume of $t_j^{\mathscr{A}}(T_n)$.

Corollary 3. Let $j_n = o(n^{3/4})$. Then we have the following convergences in probability:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{0\le j\le j_n} P_n(j) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sup_{0\le j\le j_n} V_n(j) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0.$$

Finally, we show a result about small cycles surrounding the boundary in uniform triangulations with a perimeter small enough compared to their volume.

Lemma 4. Let $p_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $r_n = o(n^{1/4})$ be such that $p_n = o(r_n^2)$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the probability of the event

"there is a cycle γ in T_{n,p_n} of length at most r_n such that the part of T_{n,p_n} lying between $\partial T_{n,p_n}$ and γ contains at most εn vertices"

goes to 1 as $n \to +\infty$.

This result is not surprising. In the context of quadrangulations with a non-simple boundary, it is a consequence of the convergence of quadrangulations with boundaries to Brownian disks, see [1]. However, no scaling limit result is known yet for triangulations with boundaries. Hence, we will rely on a result of Krikun about small cycles in the UIPT, that we will combine with Lemma 1. Here is a restatement of Theorem 6 of [9].

Theorem 2 (Krikun)**.** For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a constant C such that for all r, with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ there is a cycle of length at most Cr surrounding $B_r^\bullet(T_\infty)$.

Note that Krikun deals with type-II triangulations, i.e. with multiple edges but no loops, but the decomposition used in [9] is still valid and even a bit simpler in the type-I setting, see [5].

Proof of Lemma 4. By Lemma 1 it is possible to couple T_∞ and T_{n,p_n} in such a way that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_\infty)\backslash B^\bullet_{r'_n}(T_\infty) \subset B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_{n,p_n})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1, \tag{5}$$

where $r'_n = o(r_n)$. On the other hand, by Theorem 2, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{there is a cycle } \gamma \text{ of length} \leq r_n \text{ in } T_\infty \text{ that surrounds } B^\bullet_{r'_n}(T_\infty)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

If such a γ exists in T_∞ then it must stay in $B^\bullet_{r_n}(T_\infty)$. Since $r_n = o(n^{1/4})$, the probability that the number of vertices lying inside of γ is greater than εn goes to 0 by Theorem 2 of [4]. But if the event of (5) holds and if such a cycle exists in T_∞, then in T_{n,p_n} there is a cycle γ of length at most r_n such that the part of T_{n,p_n} lying between $\partial T_{n,p_n}$ and γ contains at most εn vertices. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Our main task will be to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5. Let $k_n = o(n^{5/4})$. Then there are $t_n \in \mathscr{T}_n$ and $\ell_n = o(n^{1/4})$ such that the probability, conditionally on $T_n(0) = t_n$, that there is a cycle of length at most ℓ_n that separates $T_n(k_n)$ in two parts of volume at least $\frac{n}{4}$ goes to 1 as $n \to +\infty$.

We first define the initial triangulation $T_n(0)$ we will be interested in: let $T_n^1(0)$ and $T_n^2(0)$ be two independent uniform triangulations with a boundary of length 1 and with respectively $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ inner vertices. We write $T_n(0)$ for the triangulation obtained by gluing together the boundaries of $T_n^1(0)$ and $T_n^2(0)$. We shall sometimes omit n in the notation when there is no ambiguity.

We will now perform an exploration of the triangulation while it gets flipped: the part T^1 will be considered as the "discovered" part and T^2 as the "unknown" part of the map. More precisely, we define by induction $T_n^1(k)$ and $T_n^2(k)$ such that $T_n(k)$ is obtained by gluing together the boundaries of $T_n^1(k)$ and $T_n^2(k)$. The two triangulations for $k = 0$ are defined above. Now assume we have constructed $T_n^1(k)$ and $T_n^2(k)$. Then:

- if e_k lies inside of $T^1(k)$ then $T^1(k+1) = \mathfrak{flip}(T^1(k), e_k)$ and $T^2(k+1) = T^2(k)$,
- if e_k lies inside of $T^2(k)$ then $T^1(k+1) = T^1(k)$ and $T^2(k+1) = \mathfrak{flip}(T^2(k), e_k)$,
- if $e_k \in \partial T^1(k)$, we write f_k for the face of $T^2(k)$ that is adjacent to e_k, and we let $T^2(k+1)$ be the connected component of $T^2(k)\backslash f_k$ with the largest volume and $T^1(k+1) = \mathfrak{flip}\big(T(k)\backslash T^2(k+1), e_k\big)$.

We now set $\widetilde{P}_n(k) = |\partial T_n^1(k)|$ and $\widetilde{V}_n(k) = \left|V\left(T_n^1(k)\right)\right| - \left|V\left(T_n^1(0)\right)\right| + 1$ (we shall omit the n in the notation when there is no ambiguity). Note that $\widetilde{V}_n(k)$ is nondecreasing in k.

For $k \geq 0$, we define a random variable $e_k^* \in E(T^1(k)) \cup \{\star\}$ as follows: if e_k lies inside or on the boundary of $T^1(k)$ then $e_k^* = e_k$, and if not then $e_k^* = \star$. We also define $\mathcal{F}_k$ as the σ-algebra generated by the variables $\left(T^1(i)\right)_{0\leq i\leq k}$ and $(e_i^*)_{0\leq i\leq k-1}$.

Lemma 6. For all k, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_k$, the triangulation $T^2(k)$ is a uniform triangulation with a boundary of length $\widetilde{P}(k)$ and $\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil - \widetilde{V}(k)$ inner vertices.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on k. For $k = 0$ it is obvious by the definition of $T^2(0)$. Let $k \geq 0$ be such that the lemma holds for k.

- If e_k^* lies inside $T^1(k)$, the result follows from the fact that $T^2(k) = T^2(k+1)$ and that conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_k$, the triangulation $T^2(k)$ is independent of e_k^*.
- If $e_k^* = \star$, it follows from the invariance of the uniform measure on $\mathscr{T}_{n,p}$ under flipping of a uniform edge among those which do not lie on the boundary.
- If $e_k^* \in \partial T^1(k)$, this is a standard peeling step: by invariance under rerooting of a uniform triangulation with fixed perimeter and volume, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_k$ and e_k, the triangulation $T^2(k)$ rooted at e_k is uniform. Hence, if the third vertex of the face f_k of $T^2(k)$ adjacent to e_k lies inside of $T^2(k)$, the remaining part of $T^2(k)$ is a uniform triangulation with a boundary of length $\widetilde{P}(k) + 1$ and $\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil - \widetilde{V}(k) - 1$ inner vertices. If the third vertex of f_k lies on $\partial T^2(k)$, then the face f_k separates $T^2(k)$ in two independent uniform triangulations with fixed perimeters and volumes, and the lemma follows.

□

We now define the stopping times τ_j as the times at which the flipped edge lies on the boundary of the unknown part of the map, that is, the times k at which we discover new parts of $T^2(k)$: we set $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_{j+1} = \inf\{k > \tau_j | e_k \in \partial T^1(k)\}$ for $j \geq 0$. We also write $P_n(j) = \widetilde{P}_n(\tau_j + 1)$ and $V_n(j) = \widetilde{V}_n(\tau_j + 1)$.

Then Lemma 6 shows that (P_n, V_n) is a Markov chain with the same transitions as the perimeter and volume processes associated to the peeling process of a uniform triangulation with a boundary of length 1 and $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ inner vertices. Hence, Corollary 3 provides estimates for this process. Our next lemma will allow us to estimate the times τ_j.

Lemma 7. Let $k_n = o(n^{5/4})$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{\varepsilon n^{3/4}} > k_n\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

Proof. Conditionally on P_n, the variables $\tau_{j+1} - \tau_j$ are independent geometric variables with respective parameters $\frac{P_n(j)}{n}$. Hence, $\tau_{\varepsilon n^{3/4}}$ dominates the sum S_n of $\varepsilon n^{3/4}$ i.i.d. geometric variables with parameter $Q_n = \frac{1}{n}\max_{0\leq j\leq \varepsilon n^{3/4}} P_n(j)$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_n|P_n] = \varepsilon n^{3/4} Q_n = \varepsilon n^{5/4} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{0\leq j\leq \varepsilon n^{3/4}} P_n(j).$$

By the results of [4], the factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\max_{0\leq j\leq \varepsilon n^{3/4}} P_n(j)$ converges in distribution, so $\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_n|P_n]}{\varepsilon n^{5/4}}$ converges in distribution so $\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_n|P_n]}{k_n} \to +\infty$ in probability. By the weak law of large numbers we get $\frac{S_n}{k_n} \to +\infty$ in probability so $\frac{\tau_{\varepsilon n^{3/4}}}{k_n} \to +\infty$ in probability. □

By combining Corollary 3 and Lemma 7 we get the following result.

Lemma 8. Let $k_n = o(n^{5/4})$. Then we have the convergences

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\widetilde{P}_n(k_n) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n}\widetilde{V}_n(k_n) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0$$

in probability.

Proof. By Lemma 7 there is a deterministic sequence $j_n = o(n^{3/4})$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{j_n} > k_n) \to 1$. This means that with probability going to 1 as $n \to +\infty$ there is $J \leq j_n$ such that $\tau_J < k_n \leq \tau_{J+1}$ so

$$\widetilde{P}_n(k_n) = P_n(J) \leq \sup_{0\leq j\leq j_n} P_n(j) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{V}_n(k_n) = V_n(J) \leq \sup_{0\leq j\leq j_n} V_n(j).$$

But we know from Corollary 3 that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sup_{0\leq j\leq j_n} P_n(j), \frac{1}{n}\sup_{0\leq j\leq j_n} V_n(j)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(P)} 0,$$

which proves Lemma 8. □

So $T_n^2(k_n)$ has the distribution of $T_{n/2-\widetilde{V}_n(k_n),\widetilde{P}_n(k_n)}$ and there is $p_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{P}_n(k_n) < p_n \text{ and } n/2 - \widetilde{V}_n(k_n) > \frac{n}{3}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1.$$

Let r_n be such that $r_n = o(n^{1/4})$ and $p_n = o(r_n^2)$ (take for example $r_n = n^{1/8}p_n^{1/4}$). By Lemma 4, with probability going to 1 as $n \to +\infty$, there is a cycle γ in $T_n^2(k_n)$ of length at most r_n such that the part of $T_n^2(k_n)$ lying between $\partial T_n^2(k_n)$ and γ has volume at most $\frac{n}{6}$. Moreover we have $\widetilde{V}_n(k_n) = o(n)$ in probability by Lemma 8, so the two parts of $T_n(k_n)$ separated by γ both have volume at least $\frac{n}{4}$, which proves Proposition 5.

The proof of our main theorem is now easy: let $\mathscr{T}_n^{\bowtie}$ be the set of the triangulations t of the sphere with n vertices in which there is a cycle of length at most ℓ_n that separates t in two parts of volume at least $\frac{n}{4}$. Let also $k_n = o(n^{5/4})$. By Proposition 5 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_n(k_n) \in \mathscr{T}_n^{\bowtie}) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 1,$$

whereas by Corollary 1.2 of [11], if $T_n(\infty)$ denotes a uniform variable on $\mathscr{T}_n$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_n(\infty) \in \mathscr{T}_n^{\bowtie}) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0.$$

Hence, the total variation distance between the distributions of $T_n(k_n)$ and $T_n(\infty)$ goes to 1 as $n \to +\infty$ so the mixing time is greater than k_n for n large enough. Since this is true for any $k_n = o(n^{5/4})$, the mixing time must be at least $cn^{5/4}$ with $c > 0$.

We end this paper by a few remarks about our lower bound and an open question.

Remark 9. We proved a lower bound on the mixing time in the worst case, but our proof still holds for the mixing time from a typical starting point. We just need to fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small, take as initial condition a uniform triangulation $T_n(0)$ conditionned on $\left|\partial B^{\bullet}_{n^{1/4}}(T_n(0))\right| \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{n}$ and $\frac{n}{3} \leq \left|B^{\bullet}_{n^{1/4}}(T_n(0))\right| \leq \frac{2n}{3}$ and let $T_n^1(0) = B^{\bullet}_{n^{1/4}}(T_n(0))$. The event on which we condition has probability bounded away from 0 (by the results of [4] and coupling arguments) and after time $o(n^{5/4})$ there is still a seperating cycle of length $O(\varepsilon^{1/2}n^{1/4})$.

Remark 10. Here is a back-of-the-enveloppe computation that leads us to believe the lower bound we give is sharp if we start from a typical triangulation. The lengths of the geodesics in a uniform triangulation of volume n are of order $n^{1/4}$, so if we fix two vertices x and y the probability that a flip hits the geodesic from x to y is roughly $n^{-3/4}$. Hence, if we do $n^{5/4}$ flips, about $n^{1/2}$ of them will affect the distance between x and y. If we believe that this distance evolves roughly like a random walk, it will vary of about $\sqrt{n^{1/2}} = n^{1/4}$, which shows we are at the right scale. Of course, there are many reasons why this computation seems hard to be made rigourous, but it does not seem to be contradicted by numerical simulations.

Finally, note that even in the simpler case of triangulations of a polygon, the lower bound $n^{3/2}$ is believed to be sharp but the best known upper bound [13] is only $n^{5+o(1)}$. In our case we were not even able to prove the following.

Conjecture 11. The mixing time of $(T_n(k))_{k\geq 0}$ is polynomial in n.

References

[1] J. Bettinelli and G. Miermont. Compact Brownian surfaces I. Brownian disks. *arXiv:1507.08776*, 2015.

[2] T. Budzinski. The hyperbolic Brownian plane. *arxiv:1604.06622*, Apr. 2016.

[3] P. Caputo, F. Martinelli, A. Sinclair, and A. Stauffer. Random lattice triangulations: Structure and algorithms. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):1650–1685, 06 2015.

[4] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. Scaling limits for the peeling process on random maps. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. (to appear).*

[5] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. First-passage percolation and local perturbations on random planar maps. *arXiv:1511.04264*, 2015.

[6] J. Jurkiewicz, A. Krzywicki, and B. Petersson. A numerical study of discrete euclidean Polyakov surfaces. *Physics Letters B*, 168(3):273–278, 1986.

[7] V. Kazakov, I. Kostov, and A. Migdal. Critical properties of randomly triangulated planar random surfaces. *Physics Letters B*, 157(4):295 – 300, 1985.

[8] H. Komuro. The diagonal flips of triangulations on the sphere. *Yokohama Math. Journal*, 44(2):115–122, 1997.

[9] M. Krikun. A uniformly distributed infinite planar triangulation and a related branching process. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 307(Teor. Predst. Din. Sist. Komb. i Algoritm. Metody. 10):141–174, 282–283, 2004.

[10] M. Krikun. Explicit enumeration of triangulations with multiple boundaries. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1):Research Paper 61, 14 pp. (electronic), 2007.

[11] J.-F. Le Gall and F. Paulin. Scaling limits of bipartite planar maps are homeomorphic to the 2-sphere. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 18(3):893–918, 2008.

[12] D. A. Levin, Y. Peres, and E. L. Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times.* Providence, R.I. American Mathematical Society, 2009.

[13] L. McShine and P. Tetali. On the mixing time of the triangulation walk and other Catalan structures. In *Randomization Methods in Algorithm Design, Proceedings of a DIMACS Workshop, Princeton, New Jersey, USA, December 12-14, 1997*, pages 147–160, 1997.

[14] M. S. Molloy, B. Reed, and W. Steiger. On the mixing rate of the triangulation walk. In *DIMACS Series in Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci*, volume 43, pages 179–190, 1998.

[15] K. Wagner. Bemerkungen zum Vierfarbenproblem. *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, 46:26–32, 1936.